of applicability or otherwise of the provisions of Monopolies and Restricitive Trade Practices Act, 1969 is considered by the Monoplies & Restricitive Trade Practices Commission, as and when a complaint is made.

(b) No such complaint has been received by the Monopolies & Restrictive Trade Practices Commission in the recent past.

(c) Does not arise.

Review Applications of the drug companies

1982. SHRIMATI MANORAMA PANDEY:
SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU:

Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Supreme Court allowed the appeal filed by Government in price litigation case and dismissed judgement of High Court dated the 10th April, 1987 in the writ petition.

(b) whether it is also a fact that the Supreme Court gave directions to dispose of review applications after giving a notice of hearing to the manufacturer and hearing to be given within two months from the date of judgement and review application to be disposed of within two weeks;

(c) if so, when was the notice of hearing iss was the hearing given to each;

(d) when the review application of each company was disposed of; and

(c) what were the points raised by each company in the review petition and which points were accepted by Government and at what price liability of each was determined?

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY): (a) The Supreme Court allowed the appeals filed by the Union of India against the judgement of the High Court in respect of the companies involved in the Supreme Court case in April/May 1987.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) to (e) A Price Review Committee (called 'Murthy Committee') was constituted to give hearings to the companies involved in the Supreme Court case and recommend prices to the Government. Before the recommendations of this Committee could be given effect to, a number of representations were received against the findings of the Price Review Committee. It has, therefore, been decided to have a fresh look into the findings of the Price Review Committee and the developments thereafter.

Complaint lodged by the former Chairman, Hindustan Photo Films against the present Chairman

1983. SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:
SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY
SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether a complaint with him has been lodged by Shri M.S. Appa Rao former Chairman of HPF against Shri P.R.S. Rao present Chairman-cum-MaiKi^ing Director alleging serious malpractices in the day. to day running of HPF as reported in the Indian Express dated April 26. 1990; and

(b) if so. what action Government have taken and when?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI AJIT SINGH): (a) and (b) Complaints had been received from Shri M.S. Appa Rao, former Chairman of HPF against the present CMD of the

company. These have not been found to be based on facts.

Litigation against SSI units by HPF Mfg. Co. Ltd.

1984. SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Hindustan Photo Film Manufacturing Company Ltd. has entered into litigation with several SSI units with regard to the import of Jumbo Rolls of various items by them;

(b) if so, what is the total expenditure incurred by HPF till date on such litigation;

(c) whether his Ministry have given sanction to HPF to enter into such litigation against SSI units; and

(d) if so, on what grounds and justification?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHItl AJIT SINGH): (a) to (d) M/s. Hindustan Photo Films Ltd. (HPF) has not entered into litigation with any SSI units. Some private sector units, reportedly belonging, to the SSI sector, have entered into litigation with the Union of India and HPF has only got impleaded as a co-respondent with a view to protect its interests as a commercial organisation.

HPF Project for the Manufacture of blue sensitive X-Ray Film

1985. SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: SHRI V NARAYANASAMY: SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA:

Will- the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that HPF has been allowed to remit a sum of Rs. 100 crore as technical know-how and training fee out of the total project for the manufacture of blue sensitive X-Ray Film; and

(b) if so, what were the justifications for such unreasonably high technical know-how fees particularly considering that Slue sensitive X-Ray Film being an out-dated technology, is being replaced all over the world by green sensitive X-Ray Film which is cheaper in cost and has less harmful effects on human body?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI AJIT SINGH): (a) and (b) M/s. Hindustan Photo Films (HPF) is presently setting up a project with a high technology content for manufacture of Polyester-based medical X-ray, Industrial X-ray and graphic art films in technical collaboration with M/s. Du Pont, USA. The blue sensitive film which will be produced by HPF is used worldwide. Amongst others, the lumpsum know-how fee payable to M/s.]Du Pont, USA is US $ 46.45 million (net of taxes).

Imported photosensitised material rytag uncleared at various ports

1986. SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that photosensitised materials of X-Ray and Graphic Art Films worth crores of rupees imported by various importers are lying at various ports uncleared, due to multidimensional litigation initiated by Hindustan Photo Films and these